

Tomorrow is New Moon day. Is it the wish of the Hon'ble Members that we shall meet at the usual hour or a little later?

(Some voices: At the usual hour).

Then we will meet at the usual time.

VOTING OF DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (cont.)

1 Land Revenue—Rs. 3,58,296

Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu (Diwan Peishkar): Sir, I beg to move for a grant of Rs. 3,58,296 under "Land Revenue". There is no special feature in this year's budget and therefore I am not making any speech. As and when the cut motions are moved I shall answer them.

CUT MOTION No. 6

Excluding certain agriculturists from payment of land-tax

Mr. V. J. Mathai (Planters): Sir, I rise to move "to reduce the allotment of Rs. 90,979 for establishment—Salaries—by Re. 1." The object of my motion is to discuss the justice and expediency of excluding agriculturists getting an income of Rs. 600 and less per annum from payment of Land Revenue. I may submit before the House that my intention to raise a discussion on this issue is not based purely on ideological grounds or on theoretical grounds nor is it my desire to jump into Utopia irrespective of considerations of practicability. I have only to put two short questions on this issue. The first is as to why are you excluding people in other professions from payment of income when their income is below Rs. 2,000? The answer is clear that the Government consider that the persons in other occupations do require about 2,000 rupees for their maintenance and daily necessities of life, so that they may contribute to the good of the body economic by their exertions. I raise this question. Are the Government not aware that the agricultural profession, if I may say so, is more important than any other profession in the world? I need not go any further on this. It is plain. Will a trader get on without agriculture? Will anybody as for that matter live a day without agriculture? Therefore I can boldly assert that agriculture is perhaps the basic industry and the basic profession in the whole world. If that is so why is it that there is no consideration for the maintenance of an agriculturist? An agriculturist who owns two paras of paddy field and their number is legion in these days of fragmentations of holdings may not be making more than 10 paras per annum. He will not make more than 4 paras of paddy per para of paddy field. The late Mr. Sankara Menon's report will support me when I say that and if it is 8 paras of paddy he gets only 10 rupees according to the Government rate. Sir, Government are demanding from such an agriculturist one-fourth of that income. Rs. 2—8—0 out of Rs. 10 putting it at one rupee 4 as. per para of paddy. If such is the incidence of revenue in the State I say it is unjustifiable. If the understanding is that because the agriculturist is using public land for raising his income, I ask this question whether a trader is not using public utilities of the State for maintaining his trade? Does he not require the roads to take things to his go-down, does he not require the backwaters to carry his goods? These are common property. Even the trader requires the backwaters for taking his merchandise. If he requires the roads and the backwaters to take his merchandise to his go-down and to the bazar, is he not also bound to pay some tax? Should you not collect 2½ rupees from a trader who makes Rs. 10. That is the second point that arises. Do you not consider the encouragement of the agricultural industry as the most important thing that is possible? Has it not been recognised all over the world? Is not this taxation inequitable?

The next statement I have to make is this, that this is one of the programmes, constructive programmes, of the Indian National Congress, passed unanimously in the Lucknow or Tripuri Congress that a bare subsistence minimum should be given to the agriculturists free from all taxation. That was also the subject of a Bill brought before this House by that strong advocate of the agriculturists, I mean, Mr. Ibrahim the Agriculturists' Bare Subsistence Bill. There is a lot of weight behind it. It was not considered properly.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan (Chalakkudi): But then you opposed it.

Mr. V. J. Mathai (Planters): Not the principle never, unless I were drunk. Mathai sober will never oppose that measure.

Therefore, Sir, with these remarks I would place this most important matter for the earnest consideration and discussion of this House.

***Mr. A. V. Moothedan (Chalakkudi):** I have very great pleasure to support the idea underlying this cut motion. Now it is a very important question that land tax should be converted into a tax on agricultural income. This question was brought before the Council some three or four years ago. I may at the very outset say that this is a very complicated question, because we are getting 12 lakhs from land tax.

Mr. V. J. Mathai (Planters): Minus 3½ lakhs for expenditure.

***Mr. A. V. Moothedan (Chalakkudi):** Some Officers will be necessary and some expenditure also is necessary. The Madras Government have also appointed a committee some time back and that officer submitted a big report on the subject. This is a subject which ought to be investigated thoroughly. In Bengal and the Sind Provinces, there was a proposal to convert land tax into a tax on agricultural income. But I must say that nothing should be done to weaken the position of the agriculturists. The agriculturist is the backbone of the country. As Goldsmith has said in the Village School Master, the peasant forms the backbone of the country. My friend suggests that the tax should be made in accordance with the income of the agriculturists, that only income over Rs. 600 should be taxed. I say it should be Rs. 1,000. Anybody may get Rs. 600 in these days when paddy is so costly and when other crops, such as ragi, tapioca, etc., are also raised. Therefore, 600 rupees will not be a satisfactory minimum. I should say it must be 1,000. Statistics should be collected before doing anything. It requires great and thorough investigation. What is the income of each agriculturist will have to be carefully gone into. Before starting legislation, we must know exactly what is the approximate estimate of the income of these agriculturists. And then what are the classes of people to be excluded, and what is the basis, and what should be the rate of tax on the income, so that you may realise these 10 or 20 lakhs. So, these matters may be looked into and then it is very good. I think the present Government may not be able to tackle this question. A Government consisting of a Council of Ministers, that body, will be able to tackle this question. For the present, they may carry on some investigations and collect statistics. I would say this is not the proper time for introducing the system.

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon (Cranganur): Why?

Mr. A. V. Moothedan (Chalakkudi): Because only a fully responsible Government will be able to tackle this measure. It requires a lot of imagination. It is a bold step and requires much imagination. The Government civilians always move in a groove. With 20 or 30 years, service, they are not willing for any deviation from that. They are very very conservative.

Mr. V. J. Mathai (Planters): They are very bold. They have boldly introduced rationing. And it has succeeded.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan (Chalakkudi): That is due to sheer necessity. But here there is no pressing necessity. These officers who are sitting there are very very conservative and they are always opposing any change.

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon (Cranganur): Question.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan (Chalakkudi): That is my opinion.

Mr. V. J. Mathai (Planters): You say, the Government are conservative. I think they are the boldest Government.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan (Chalakkudi): I accept it has been taken up boldly. I say in the matter of rationing, our Government have been a model for the whole of India. I am proud of it. In spite of the imperfections and complaints—for everything under the sun there will be complaints—our Government have been able to do it very well. But that is not the matter here. Here, what is the pressing necessity? That is a question affecting the stomach. Here you say some system of taxation should be changed to one agricultural income. What is the pressing necessity for it.

Mr. V. J. Mathai (Planters): My point is exclusion of some income.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan (Chalakkudi): For that agricultural income should be calculated. You say certain income should be excluded. Without knowing the whole state of affairs and getting all the details, how can you say that certain sections should be excluded. The income has to be calculated. And after all what is the tax collected? There may be only about 60,000 pattadars in the State. I hope the Diwan Peishkar would correct me.

Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu (Diwan Peishkar): We have got 99,000 pattadars in the State.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan (Chalakkudi): What is the number of pattadars whose tax is less than one rupee?

Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu (Diwan Peishkar): I will give you that. It is nearly 38,000. The number of persons who pay a rupee and less than a rupee is about 38,000.

*Speech not corrected by the Hon'ble Member.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan (Chalakkudi): So, about 40,000 of the pattadars are paying less than a tax of one rupee. We are paying 10 annas for one meal and so these 40,000 pattadars are not paying much. What is the necessity for amending the law. There is no pressing necessity for that now. I say it is good, I welcome it. It requires elaborate enquiries and investigation. With these observations, I conclude my speech.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan (Vaddakancheri): I am glad Sir, that this useful subject has been brought forward by an Hon'ble Member of this House who is very much interested in agriculture, planting and cognate topics. I am glad for the simple reason that he has brought forward through this cut motion an occasion for a discussion of a useful subject. I am glad not because that he has brought forward a subject which we could readily accede to at this stage. That is not the reason why I am glad. I would respectfully submit to this House that this is only a portion of a major question, an all-important question, namely the abolition of land tax, to be substituted by a proper income-tax according to the income from agriculture. In that major scheme of very great utility this will become a matter of detail. That is, when we take up the question of abolishing land tax to be substituted by an equitable taxation on the principles of income-tax, by this question will arise where is the margin to be drawn, whether it is at an income of Rs. 2,000 as is the present case with regard to income-tax, or whether it should be higher or lower. In that perspective the subject has to be viewed.

Mr. President: The Hon'ble Member is not exactly speaking on this cut motion. The present cut motion is only to exclude certain persons from tax. There is no suggestion that agriculturists should not pay tax.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan (Vadakkancheri): I submit, Sir that this can be considered only as a matter of detail of a major scheme. Therefore it was that I was referring to the major question. That is, only when the major question is discussed, this will become a matter for discussion as a matter of detail. It is in that perspective that I view the question. And viewed from that stand-point, just at present, in the form in which it is brought forward, I do not find my way or for that matter, the party to which I have the honour to belong does not find its way to support the motion. One other difficulty which I want to point out to the Hon'ble Mover of this motion and to this Hon'ble House is that this will have its repercussions elsewhere and the repercussions will be adverse to certain things that we are obtaining today. The criterion in franchise, one of the most important criteria of franchise, is the land tax. Every person paying any tax is now a voter (*Hear, Hear*). And the fight of this Council, a legitimate fight of this Council, had been and is, that we are not satisfied with the present franchise, extended though it be; we want adult franchise is the position the Party to which I belong takes up. I believe that is the attitude of the whole House also. The adoption of this resolution at this stage in the form in which it is brought will have the immediate effect of reducing a large portion of the voters, for the Legislative Council election, the general election which I am confident will be fought towards the close of the next Malayalam year. We are only at a short distance, Sir, from the general elections. So, for that election, you will have a very large number of voters being removed from the list. Though there may be Hon'ble Members or gentlemen who like the reduction in the number of voters, I do not belong to that class, nor does the party to which I belong, belong to that class.

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar (Nellayi): The list is already prepared. There need not be any fear on that account.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan (Vadakkancheri): Therefore, Sir, in our own interests and in the interests of a widened franchise, we cannot, we do not, find our way to support the motion in the form in which it is brought forward. Therefore, I would respectfully submit before this House that the party to which I have the honour to belong.....

A. Voice: Why this emphasis?

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan (Vadakkancheri): I have a particular object, Sir, in laying this emphasis, this extra emphasis on the words "to the Party to which I have the honour to belong", because I have been mis-interpreted and misunderstood.

Therefore, Sir, in the form in which the proposition is brought forward, the Party is constrained sorrowfully to oppose it. This is the attitude of the Party.

Mr. A. B. Salem (Mattancheri): This is a proposal which can never be considered by the Government at any time, at present or in future. Land tax has come down from ancient times to the present day and the effect of this will be to do away with it. At the outset I would say it is not the cultivator alone who owns the land. Any man may come into possession of land, however much he may not like to have it. A man may not have any intention of owning any land. Still he comes in possession of land somehow or other. When you say that a man

getting from agricultural land, only Rs. 50 or Rs. 600 he should not be taxed, it means nothing. One fifth of the income from land should go to the Government at all times, and there is no escape from it. In India it has been so. All over the world it is so. There is no place in the world where land tax is being abolished. Your proposition will come to that. Suppose everybody fragment their lands to get only Rs. 600 income.

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon (*Cranganur*): There is no land tax in England.

Mr. A. B. Salem (*Mattancheri*): Suppose a man getting Rs. 6,000 income from land has six or ten children and a wife and some other relatives. He divides his properties among them so that nobody gets more than Rs. 500 income. Then what will be the position? Nobody will be bound to pay tax. Such a thing will happen at the next moment if this suggestion is adopted. You will find the Registration officer will become very busy in registering partitions of the properties, with the result that there will be absolutely no agricultural income to be taxed at all. Therefore neither agricultural income nor land tax will come to the Government. Then how can the Government carry on? I think this is a proposition which can never be entertained by this Government or a popular Government or any responsible Government. This is all what I have to say.

Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu (*Diwan Peishkar*): Government oppose this on grounds of principle and before entering into that, I would just read the cut motion itself. It reads as follows.—To reduce the allotment of Rs. 90,779 for A Establishment—Salaries by Re. 1 to discuss the justice and expediency of excluding agriculturists getting an income of Rs. 600 and less per annum from payment of Land Revenue. The other day I was criticised for being accurate.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan (*Vadakkancheri*): It is for not being accurate. It was hypertechnical.

Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu (*Diwan Peishkar*): Land Revenue is not tax on any persons and if agriculturists who get Rs. 600 and less are to be excluded—

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon (*Cranganur*): The land should pay. Is that the point?

Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu (*Diwan Peishkar*): That is one thing. Apart from that, who is an agriculturist? Who all should be classed as agriculturists? I am an agriculturist in the ordinary sense of term. If I am excluded from payment of any tax because I am an agriculturist, and because I get an income of less than Rs. 600 from agriculture, there will be few person who will be liable to pay any tax. We cannot subscribe to a proposition of that type. Secondly, coming to the principle of it, the principle of taxation so far as Land Revenue is concerned, has not been I think, properly understood. Now, land is an asset which belongs to Government. When any Government conquers any territory, or adds to its territory, it means it adds to its assets. The land belongs to the Government. And taking the analogy of what the Hon'ble mover said, he asks, should he not get something for himself? The income which he gets from this, is he not entitled to keep it for himself? I say, take the case of an ordinary retail shopkeeper. He has not got sufficient means to invest in the trade. He borrows something and that is the asset. In fact he lives on that. He spends his energy in making a small living out of it. He is living upon the profits arising out of the capital. Where is the capital? The capital is the borrowed capital. He works up that capital and makes it yield something. He spends his labour, he uses his intelligence and he spends his time on it. He makes his living out of it. Well, on that ground, a person who makes the advance for the business is he not to be given anything for the money which he lends? Take that instance. Similarly, this is a capital upon which the agriculturist makes his income. The agriculturist is supplied with the capital for the work which he puts upon it by the Government. The Government must get something just as the other person who lent the money get something. The Government must get compensation for the use of that land.

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon (*Cranganur*): May I take it that the State is making a living out of it?

Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu (*Diwan Peishkar*): The State is running a Government. I am only putting an analogy. Every merchant whether big or small, even in partnership if they borrow capital, they always charge some interest on the capital and then deduct it before they divide the profits. Similarly, here the State is running the administration. One of the sources from which revenue is obtained for the purpose of running the administration is this and this is the basic asset upon which from the very oldest times, I think, from the times, Governments

came into existence and land came into existence from the very earliest times, this has been the first and foremost item which has been taxed because it is a very tangible asset.

Something was said about England that in England there was no land tax. There is no small holder there. There are only big holders and the law of inheritance is the law of primogeniture. There it is tax on income because the land holder is a big holder. The holdings there are not divided. But it is not so here.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan (Chalakkudi) : What is the difference here?

Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu (Diwan Peishkar) : There is a great difference in the fundamental principle. As the Hon'ble Member for Mattancheri said, the final result if this measure is accepted, would be that the land will be divided into fragmentations and small holdings when the members in the family increase and it will be to such an extent that we get no land tax or no land to tax.

Mr. A. Eachara Menon (Chittur-Rural) : Is it to evade the tax?

Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu (Diwan Peishkar) : Not exactly to evade tax but when population increase and the number of members in the family increase, each man may claim his share. It is just ordinary.

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon (Cranganur) : May I know when exactly land tax was introduced in Cochin State.

Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu (Diwan Peishkar) : I do not know.

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon (Cranganur) : It was only after 1700. You may take it from me.

Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu (Diwan Peishkar) : Adopting another argument from another Hon'ble Member, you will find that the number of pattadars who pay tax up to Re. 1 is nearly 38,000; Those who pay Re. 1 to 5 is 30,000 and Rs. 5 to Rs. 10 is 15,000. Out of 99,000 or one lakh of pattadars we have nearly 80,000 persons who pay less than Rs. 10. Now what is the yield that is necessary to pay a tax of less than Rs. 10? You will find that the maximum rate for paddy land tax here is Rs. 7-8-0, except of course in Chittur Taluk, where we have added something more for irrigation cess. The average will not come to more than Rs. 4-8-0, much less than Rs. 4-8-0 per acre. As regards garden lands, it depends upon the number of trees. In the case of cocoanut trees it is 3 annas 6 pies per tree. Now what is the proportion of the yield which he gets to enable him to pay tax. When so compared, the tax is so small, so insignificant. If he has to pay Rs. 3-8-0 or Rs. 4-8-0 per acre, how many paras of paddy does he require in these days? 4 paras, or less than 4 paras. What is the average yield per acre? It is about 80 paras, that is he gets about Rs. 100. Out of the Rs. 100 that he gets, he has to pay only Rs. 4-8-0. Where he has to pay the maximum tax of Rs. 7-8-0, the yield that he actually gets is about 200 and odd paras of paddy.

Mr. V. J. Mathai (Planters) : 200 paras per acre?

Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu (Diwan Peishkar) : In some parts they say it is even more.

Mr. V. J. Mathai (Planters) : May be in Palayannur or Chittur.

Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu (Diwan Peishkar) : Now what is the incidence of taxation? It is absolutely little. It can never be said that the incidence of taxation is so high as to press heavily upon the cultivators.....

While it does not do any good to the agriculturist, the State loses nearly 12 lakhs of rupees, and the State has to run its administration. Is it fair that Government should be made to lose so largely? For these reasons I oppose the motion.

Mr. President : I would suggest for the consideration of the Hon'ble Members that this is not the appropriate time at which to consider the question of abolition of land revenue. We have got experts who have advised the Government of India regarding the question of inflation and their opinion has been to levy a surcharge on land revenue. The Madras Government have just recently increased the land revenue and also many parts of the Provinces. It is due to the abnormal condition amongst the agriculturists that the experts are considering the question of inflation in this country that the large amount of money which is flowing about in the country should be taken away—Voluntarily or otherwise from the people by increased taxation so as to try and check the evil of inflation that is going on. That is how inflation is checked successfully in British India very largely, by taking money from the people either by loan or by an enormous taxation. The rich land lord in England are paying a tax of 19 shilling 6 pence in the pound. This is the time when the agricultural produce has gone up three or four times. Therefore comparatively the tax has gone down proportionately. Is this suitable occasion on which to put before the House a proposal that a large mass of land in the State which is presumed to be the intention, of the cut-motion, should be exempted altogether from this tax?

This tax has actually been levied in many parts of India for many hundreds of years. So I would suggest to the Hon'ble Members to consider this matter and not press this cut-motion at this critical juncture.

Mr. V. J. Mathai (Planters): I fully understand the observations made by the Diwan President. I have only to say that it applies only to a very high income. So far as the observation is concerned namely the advisability of putting it to the House and pressing it now, my intention was only to have a discussion and I don't want to see that the motion is defeated. As very pertinently put by the Hon'ble Member for Vadakkancheri there are certain considerations which ought to prevail. I am not far putting the motion before the House for the vote of the House; But the discussion should be complete. So far as Mr. Ezhuthassan's first objections are concerned that there will be less voters, my reply is 'give adult franchise'. Let me not be misunderstood. I have also been advocating adult franchise or at least literacy franchise. That objection should be removed if necessary. But it should not stand in the way of adoption of this very salutary principle.

Secondly Mr. Salem was remarking that there was taxation of land at all times. That is the proposition which I cannot swallow. So far as Cochin State is concerned with which we are more concerned, the Maharajas of Cochin were never levying land tax till the invasion of Hyderali. When he imposed a tribute upon us. Those were days of scarcity for money and therefore the Maharajas were forced to levy money from the people much against their wish. The Hindu kings never collected land tax. That the first occasion on which the Hindu kings of Cochin ever levied land tax. But I may point out on the best authority of a Gentleman who is now in enemy hands—that there is no land tax in Singapore on freeholds. I have seen from the memorandum of the Cocoonut-growers of Cochin that in Ceylon, not a pie is paid for cocoonut gardens. Therefore people go on asserting things without knowing anything. I can only say their seats are not here, but elsewhere.

As regards the hypertechnical argument put forward by the Hon'ble Member for Revenue, I only submit that we don't want the Government and the Heads of Departments to stand on hair-splitting technicalities, but to give a sympathetic consideration of the questions raised and if the Diwan Peishkar continues in this strain I can only request the Government to change him and put another in his place.

Mr. President: The Hon'ble Member is making personal attacks. It is irregular.

Mr. V. J. Mathai (Planters): I am taking it very seriously because this is not the first time that this has been done. I only say that in the case of these motions which are token motions we have not got the right to put our motions as a bill. This is not the first time that we hear hypertechnical arguments intended to create laughter at the expense of the movers of necessary motions.

Mr. President: The sense of humour provoke to laughter.

Mr. V. J. Mathai (Planters): But the matter is affected. The point raised is that if agriculturists are excluded the lands remain. Are you going to tax lands if you are not going to tax the agriculturists?

As regards the question that the land belong to the Government, I have to ask three counter questions, what about Air? What about water? and What about roads?

Mr. A. B. Salem (Mattancheri): The road is taxed. The water is taxed.

Mr. V. J. Mathai (Planters): The question arises that the trader uses the roads. Why should we exclude Rs. 1,999 in his income? We have heard a reply that the trader has invested capital in the trade. I ask you whether the agriculturists have not invested capital in the land? Then as regards the fact that the trader is using his money and intelligence in the trade, I ask you is there a single paddy grower who can afford to sleep in his house during the days of dearth of water. So that if a trader has to devote his daytime to his trade an agriculturist has to devote his day and night for his profession. Therefore let there not be the answer that the trader has to devote his time and intelligence. I submit that an agriculturist has to use more intelligence than a trader. All the greatest men have come from the peasant stock. President Washington was a farmer, and he was called from the farm to preside over America. And remember he was the generalissimo of the American forces without a single pie as salary. To say that the peasant stock does not require intelligence and are not intelligent is to deny true facts.

Rao Sahib K. Ayyappan (Ezhuvas-Kanayannur): Any way he paid land tax.

Mr. V. J. Mathai (Planters): I only say that to say that no intelligence is required by the agriculturist is to deny the fact as judged from the result.

Then one word about fragmentation. As regards the fragmentation, to suggest that this will create fragmentation is to say too much. We can prevent fragmentation.

One other point raised is that more than 80,000 people are paying less than 10 rupees as tax. That is the argument for dropping the land revenue. It will benefit 80,000 people and the Government will lose at best 4 lakhs which can easily be gained by adding a pie in the rupee to the income tax. I do not think that I should speak much on this subject. I withdraw the motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn

CUT MOTION No. 7

Communal rotation in the appointment of Diwan Peishkar

Mr. A. V. Moothedan (Chalakkudi): I beg to move to reduce the allotment of Rs. 90,979 for Diwan Peishkar's Establishment by Re. 1. My object is to request the Government that the Diwan Peishkar should be a Christian for the next 10 years, then an Ezhuva then a Muslim and so on. Sir, in living memory so far in Cochin all these Diwan Peishkars have been caste Hindus. For a few months our present Excise Commissioner had been appointed as officiating Diwan Peishkar.

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon (Cranganur): What about Mr. Chacko?

Mr. A. V. Moothedan (Chalakkudi): Mr. Chacko was something else. Some say he had been the Diwan Peishkar. Some say he was not.

Mr. K. S. Panicker (Ezhuvas-Mukundapuram): Can you give the first chance to an Ezhuva?

Mr. A. V. Moothedan (Chalakkudi): I am coming to that. So far there have been only Caste Hindus as Diwan Peishkars. On the general principles of communal representation it is only fair that a Christian or one from any other communities is appointed as Diwan Peishkar according to the availability and suitability of candidates. This period of ten years need not be followed rigidly.

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon (Cranganur): Then why did you put there?

Mr. A. V. Moothedan (Chalakkudi): As I said it should not be a monopoly for caste Hindu. Every subject of His Highness the Maharaja should have the right to work as Diwan Peishkar. As far as the Christian community is concerned we are suffering great hardship. I shall state only one point. Under the Religious Worship Act of 1062, permission is required for the erection of places of public worship, namely, churches, etc. Under that the Diwan Peishkar is given powers to receive applications for erecting places of public worship. I know of one instance from my constituency. For Kodakara, a hilly region the nearest church is the Perambara church. They want to build a church there. That was objected to. When everybody is condemning materialism why should you object people who are religiously minded, who want to erect temples, churches, etc. I say it is for the good administration of the State if religion is respected. I shall take one instance, for instance theft. The Police Commissioner will not be able to guard all people from committing theft. Religion says that nobody should commit theft. If that feeling is inculcated into the minds of the people which could be done through the places of public worship there will be no theft. There have been three applications made by the people. First it was stated that the place where they wanted to construct the church was very near the public road. The second application was rejected for some other reason. When we see all these things we lose confidence in the Government because there is no temple or church very near the place. These are some of the hardships which the other communities may also be suffering. If a Christian has been appointed as Diwan Peishkar, he will be able to realise our difficulties better. This is not monopoly of any section of the people. With these words, I commend the motion for the acceptance of the House.

Mr. President: I may inform Hon'ble Members that there is no such declaration that the Diwan Peishkar should be of a particular community.

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar (Nellayi): There is a rule that one of the Judges of the High Court should always be a Christian and it is a monopoly of the Christian community. Will the Hon'ble Member like to change that and give that place to a member of other community.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan (Chalakkudi): I want notice for it. You may bring a Bill and I will say what I have to say then.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan (Vadakkancheri): Your cut motion will force us to do it.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan (Chalakkudi): The Diwan Peishkar's post is very important. There is opportunity for helping the people and for conferring patronage on many people. In